

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1, 19 and 23 have been amended. Support for the claim amendments may be found in the specification and claims as originally filed. No new matter has been added. Claims 8–18 and 24–32 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer as being drawn to non-elected inventions.

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1–7 and 19–23 will be pending in the present application, with claims 1, 19 and 23 being independent.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1–7 and 19–23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pogue, Jr. (US Patent 5,995,512) in view of Sistanizadeh et al. (US Patent 6,681,232). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Pogue, Jr. discloses a multimedia data network that includes a fiber optic data bus arranged in a star topology configuration (see abstract; col. 10, lines 15–20). The data network may be implemented in a variety of environments that require electronic communications between or among different pieces of hardware devices and equipment, or nodes in the network (see col. 6, line 65 – col. 7, line 4; col. 9, line 64 – col. 10, line 2; Figure 1). For example, Pogue, Jr. discloses an intelligent interface unit between each hardware node in the network and a network data bus. The intelligent interface unit is described as a hardware component that includes physical connections for coupling to the data bus, connections for coupling to input and output ports of a hardware node, transducers and an interface circuit (see col. 1, line 67 – col. 2, line 7).

Therefore, Pogue, Jr. focuses on the physical layer and design of the topology of the network, but is silent with respect to creating via a software interface a topology capable of taking the form of an extensible symbolic representation of an intended

media flow. As a result, Pogue, Jr. fails to disclose or suggest creating by a topology application programming interface a topology interface capable of being passed to a media processor as an extensible symbolic representation of an intended media flow, as included in independent claim 1. Similarly, Pogue, Jr. fails to disclose or suggest enabling by an application programming interface a multimedia processing function via an extensible symbolic abstraction of media objects related to one or more of the media processor parameter, the timeline parameter and the topology parameter, as included in independent claim 23. Sistanizadeh et al. fails to cure this defect.

Sistanizadeh et al. discloses a standard application programming interface that allows an SLM application to access relational data (see col. 7, lines 48–51). However, Sistanizadeh et al. fails to disclose or suggest creating by a topology application programming interface a topology interface capable of being passed to a media processor as an extensible symbolic representation of an intended media flow, as included in claim 1. Additionally, Sistanizadeh et al. fails to disclose or suggest enabling by an application programming interface a multimedia processing function via an extensible symbolic abstraction of media objects related to one or more of the media processor parameter, the timeline parameter and the topology parameter, as included in independent claim 23.

The Office Action on page 5 states that claims 19–23 have the same subject matter, and are essentially rejected for the same reasons, as claims 1–7. However, the Office Action fails to show how Pogue, Jr. and Sistanizadeh et al., alone or in combination, disclose or suggest receiving a second parameter identifying a pointer to a topology to which the segment topology node can connect, and creating by a segment topology node application programming interface a segment topology node interface as part of a topology that is incapable of alteration of input and output nodes to the segment topology node, as included in claim 19. Furthermore, the Office Action fails to show how Pogue, Jr. and Sistanizadeh et al., alone or in combination, disclose or suggest receiving a timeline parameter related to timing of events to occur for

performing media processing, and receiving a topology parameter describing a flow for the received media data, as included in claim 23.

Therefore, since Pogue, Jr. and Sistanizadeh et al., alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the elements of claims 1, 19 and 23, these claims are allowable.

Claims 2–7 depend from claim 1. Claims 20–22 depend from claim 19. As discussed above, claims 1 and 19 are allowable. For at least this reason, and the features recited therein, claims 2–7 and 20–22 are also allowable.

For at least the above reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1–7 and 19–23 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendment and remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Based on the foregoing, applicants respectfully request that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,

Microsoft Corporation

Date: June 25, 2007

By: /Sung T. Kim/

Sung T. Kim, Reg. No.: 45,398
Attorney for Applicants
Direct telephone: (703) 647-6574
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION
(Under 37 CFR § 1.8(a)) or ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

June 25, 2007
Date

/Kate Marochkina/
Signature

Kate Marochkina
Name

Application Number: 10/692,639
Attorney Docket Number: 302126.02